

REMARKS

The present communication is responsive to the Office Action issued April 4, 2008. Claims 1 and 5 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Publn. No. 2000-285056 to Kohei ("Kohei").

Kohei discloses an apparatus for viewing internet content relating to a particular advertisement. Specifically, a communication terminal is adapted to scan a barcode found on a printed advertisement. The barcode is comprised of several subcodes, which indicate which content the user is trying to access. (Kohei, [0028]). Thus, once the barcode is scanned by the mobile terminal, a wireless signal is sent to a base station, which is further connected to the internet, and the internet content may be provided to the communication terminal. (Kohei, Fig. 1).

In contrast to Kohei, claim 1 relates to scanning a graphic code to enable communication within a network. Claim 1 has been amended for clarification, and as such recites:

A terminal device registrable on a network, comprising:

a communication unit operable to use the first information as terminal identification information to establish communication through the network as registered device.

Thus, the first information is used to identify the terminal device as a registered device, and establish communication. Kohei does not even contemplate registering a device on a network, and using printed graphic codes to identify the device. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Kohei. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claim 5 has been amended to recite similar limitations to those of claim 1. Specifically, claim 5 as amended recites the steps of "registering a terminal device" and "using the first information as terminal identification information to establish communication through the network as a registered device." Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 5 is also patentable. Therefore, Applicant further requests that the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-4 and 6-8 depend from, and therefore include the limitations of, claims 1 and 5, respectively. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claims 1 and 5, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-4 and 6-8 are also patentable, and therefore requests that the rejections of same be withdrawn.

Similar to claims 1 and 5, independent claims 13 and 15 also recite limitations relating to input of graphic code from a printed medium, where the graphic code corresponds to information identifying the terminal device and thus enabling connection of the terminal device to the network. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with claims 1 and 5, Applicant also submits that claims 13 and 15 are patentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 13 and 15 be withdrawn.

Claims 14 and 16 depend from and therefore include all the limitations of claims 13 and 15, respectively. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed in connection with claims 13 and 15, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14 and 16 are patentable, and requests that their rejections be withdrawn.

Independent claim 9 recites "each of the operating instructions corresponding to a first series of graphic codes" and "an input unit operable to input from a printed medium a selected one of the first series of graphic codes corresponding to one of the operating instructions." Claim 9 further recites inputting "pieces of content corresponding to one of a second series of graphic codes" and inputting a selected code, so that

an operating unit may "execute the one of the operating instructions with respect to the one of the pieces of content."

As discussed above, Kohei teaches scanning of bar codes to access internet websites relating to content associated with the bar codes. This is neither equivalent nor comparable to the claim limitations recited above. Particularly, Kohei does not disclose scanning codes which correspond to operating instructions. Further, Kohei does not contemplate using such scanned codes in connection with any other scanned codes.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is patentable over Kohei, and thus requests that the rejection of claim 9 be withdrawn. Because claim 10 depends from and therefore includes all the limitations of claim 9, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 10 also be withdrawn.

Claim 11 recites similar limitations to those of claim 9. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 9, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is patentable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1, along with the rejection of claim 12 which depends from and includes the limitations of claim 11, be withdrawn.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he/she telephone Applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

Application No.: 10/657,364

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.0-323

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: July 7, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Natalie S. Morelli

Registration No.: 58,545

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

893262_1.DOC